



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,778	11/17/2000	Jack B. Dennis	004800.P003	7027
26384	7590	06/10/2005	EXAMINER	
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY ASSOCIATE COUNSEL (PATENTS) CODE 1008.2 4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE, S.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20375-5320			MEW, KEVIN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2664	
DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/715,778	DENNIS, JACK B.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin Mew	2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Final Action

1. Applicant's Arguments/Remarks filed on 1/4/2005 regarding claims 1-30 have been considered and claims 1-30 are currently pending.
2. Acknowledgement is made of the amended claims 1, 2, 5-11, 12, 15-22, 25-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blelloch et al. (USP 6,434,590).**

Regarding claims 1, 11, Blelloch discloses an apparatus to perform a method comprising: a processor (SY 1, see Fig. 2) capable of simultaneous execution of two or more threads of instructions (multiple processing elements and each processing element is one thread of instructions, see Fig. 2), where said processor comprises:

at least one resource unit (router RT 1, see Fig. 2) capable of being assigned to two or more of the threads (multiple processing elements, see col. 4, lines 60-67 and Fig. 2);
a priority register (priority queue) to store thread information for the threads (priority queue in which each element of the queue is a thread, see col. 14, lines 60-67, col. 15, lines 1-15,

and col. 16, lines 16-21), the thread information including a priority code corresponding to each thread (the thread information indicates whether the threads are ready, active, or suspended, see col. 14, lines 65-67), at least one of the threads requesting use of the resource unit (PE 1 requests use of router RT 1, see col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 1-10 and Fig. 2); and

a priority selector (assignment manager) coupled to the priority register (assignment manager is coupled to task queue, see AM1 and TQ1, Fig. 4) to generate assignment signal to assign (assignment manager, see col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 1-10 and Fig. 2) the at least one resource unit (assigns router RT1, col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 1-10 and Fig. 2) to the at least one of the threads (processing elements, see Fig. 2) according to the P priority codes (makes the highest priority available tasks to be drawn by the processing elements PE1, see col. 4, lines 44-48, see Figs. 1, 2, 4).

Regarding claims 2, 12, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 1 to perform the method of claim 11 wherein the at least one resource unit (router RT 1, see Fig. 2) is one of an instruction unit, a memory locking unit, a load unit, a store unit, an input/output unit, a peripheral unit interface, and a functional unit (router RT 1 performs routing function, see col. 4, lines 60-67).

Regarding claims 3, 13, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 2 to perform the method of claim 12 wherein the functional unit is one of an arithmetic unit, a logic unit; and an arithmetic and logic unit (router RT1's routing function requires logic unit, see col. 2, lines 50-51 and Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 4, 14, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 1 to perform the method of claim 11 further comprising:

an instruction multiplexer (see system SY1 of processing elements, Fig. 2) coupled to the priority selector (assignment manager, see Fig. 1) to pass instructions stored in a plurality of instruction registers (SY1 comprises a plurality of memory elements ME of the processing elements PE1, see col. 3, lines 9-19, and Fig. 2a) to execution units according to the assignment signal (to the computational units CE of the processing elements, see Fig. 2a).

Regarding claims 5, 15, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 1 to perform the method of claim 11 further comprising:

a priority assignor (a sequential scheduler, see col. 4, lines col. 4, 22-37) coupled to the priority register to set the thread information including at least one of the P priority codes corresponding to the at least one of the threads (a sequential scheduler designates each task with a code that identifies the ordering of the task in the sequence of instructions, see col. 4, lines 9-14) in response to a start instruction from an instruction decoder and dispatcher (preprocessor PP1, see steps 507, 508, Fig. 5).

Regarding claims 6, 16, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 5 to perform the method of claim 15 wherein the priority assignor sets an active flag in the priority register corresponding to the at least one of the threads in response to the start instruction (a sequential

scheduler sets available flag for those tasks that are available for scheduling, see col. 4, lines 22-37).

Regarding claims 7, 17, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 6 to perform the method of claim 16 wherein resets the active flag in the priority register corresponding to the at least one of the threads in response to a quit instruction from the instruction decoder and dispatcher (resets the live flag for a thread when the end instruction executes, see col. 11, lines 29-35).

Regarding claims 8, 18, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 1 to perform the method of claim 11 wherein the priority selector assigns the at least one resource unit (router RT 1, see Fig. 2) to the at least one of the threads (processing elements, see Fig. 2) if the at least one of the threads is not served (assignment manager determines which the set of tasks that are live, see step 510, Fig. 5) and the at least one resource unit is free (router RT is free, see col. 4, lines 60-67).

Regarding claims 9, 19, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 8 to perform the method of claim 18 wherein the at least one of the threads has highest priority code among a set of ready threads (see col. 4, lines 38-48).

Regarding claims 10, 20, Blelloch discloses the apparatus of claim 8 to perform the method of claim 18 wherein the priority selector iteratively assigns resource units to threads in

the set of ready threads according to the corresponding priority codes and resource availability until the set becomes empty (see col. 20, lines 34-38).

Regarding claim 21, Bleloch discloses a processor (a processor here is a combination of preprocessor, assignment manager and system of processing elements, see Fig. 1) capable of simultaneous execution of two or more threads of instructions comprising:

at least one a resource unit (router RT 1, see Fig. 2) to provide resource for use by the threads (provides routing functions for processing elements, see col. 3, lines 60-64) capable of being assigned to two or more of the threads (RT 1 is assigned to multiple processing elements, see col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 1-10 and Fig. 2); and

a resource prioritizer (a resource prioritizer here is a combination of preprocessor and assignment manager, see Fig. 1) coupled to the resource unit (router RT 1, see Fig. 2) to prioritize resource utilization (for determining priorities among tasks, see col. 4, lines 16-59), the resource prioritizer comprising:

a priority register (priority queue) to store thread information for the threads (priority queue in which each element of the queue is a thread. In particular, the threads are threads, see col. 14, lines 60-67, col. 15, lines 1-15, and col. 16, lines 16-21), the thread information including a priority code corresponding to each thread (the thread information indicates whether the threads are ready, active, or suspended, see col. 14, lines 65-67), at least one of the threads requesting use of the resource unit (processing elements request use of router RT 1, see col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 1-10 and Fig. 2); and

a priority selector (assignment manager) coupled to the priority register (assignment manager is coupled to task queue, see AM1 and TQ1, Fig. 4) to generate an assignment signal to assign (assignment manager informs the processing elements PE1 about the availability of tasks, see col. 4, lines 38-59) the at least one resource unit (RT 1, see Fig. 2) to the requesting thread (processing elements, see Fig. 2) according to the priority codes (makes the highest priority available tasks to be drawn by the processing elements PE1, see col. 4, lines 44-48, see Figs. 1, 2, 4).

Regarding claim 22, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 21 wherein the at least one resource unit (router RT 1, see Fig. 2) is one of an instruction unit, a memory locking unit, a load unit, a store unit, an input/output unit, a peripheral unit interface, and a functional unit (router RT 1 performs routing function, see col. 4, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 23, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 22 wherein the functional unit is one of an arithmetic unit, a logic unit, and an arithmetic and logic unit (router RT1's routing function requires logic unit, see col. 2, lines 50-51 and Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 24, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 21 the resource prioritizer further comprising:

an instruction multiplexer (see system SY1 of processing elements, Fig. 2) coupled to the priority selector (assignment manager, see Fig. 1) to pass instructions stored in a plurality of instruction registers (SY1 comprises a plurality of memory elements ME of the processing

elements PE1, see col. 3, lines 9-19, and Fig. 2a) to execution units according to the assignment signal (to the computational units CE of the processing elements, see Fig. 2a).

Regarding claim 25, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 21 wherein the resource prioritizer further comprising:

a priority assignor (a sequential scheduler, see col. 4, lines col. 4, 22-37) coupled to the priority register to set the thread information including at least one of the priority codes corresponding to the at least one of the threads (a sequential scheduler designates each task with a code that identifies the ordering of the task in the sequence of instructions, see col. 4, lines 9-14) in response to a start instruction from an instruction decoder and dispatcher (preprocessor PP1, see steps 507, 508, Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 26, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 25 wherein the priority assignor sets an active flag in the priority register corresponding to the at least one of the threads in response to the start instruction (a sequential scheduler sets available flag for those tasks that are available for scheduling, see col. 4, lines 22-37).

Regarding claim 27, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 26 wherein resets the active flag in the priority register corresponding to the at least one of the threads in response to a quit instruction from the instruction decoder and dispatcher (resets the live flag for a thread when the end instruction executes, see col. 11, lines 29-35).

Regarding claim 28, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 21 wherein the priority selector assigns the at least one resource unit (RT 1, see Fig. 2) to the at least one of the threads (processing elements, see Fig. 2) if the at least one of the threads is not served (assignment manager determines which the set of tasks that are live, see step 510, Fig. 5) and the at least one resource unit is free (each processing element draws tasks from the assignment manager (see col. 2, lines 52-67).

Regarding claim 29, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 28 wherein the at least one of the threads has highest priority code among a set of ready threads (see col. 4, lines 38-48).

Regarding claim 30, Blelloch discloses the processor of claim 28 wherein the priority selector iteratively assigns resource units to threads in the set of ready threads according to the corresponding priority codes and resource availability until the set becomes empty (see col. 20, lines 34-38).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/4/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the Applicant's argument that Bleloch does not disclose the limitation that the processor is capable of simultaneous execution of two or more threads of instructions, it is noted by the Examiner that Bleloch does disclose a system of processing elements SY1 that comprises a plurality of processing elements (see Fig. 2; SY1 is interpreted as the processor). If one processing element corresponds to one thread of instruction execution, then multiple processing elements, as shown in Fig. 2, correspond to simultaneous multiple threads of instruction executions. Therefore, the system that comprises multiple processing elements in Fig. 2 reads on the limitation that the processor is capable of simultaneous execution of two or more threads of instructions.

After the Applicant's amendment that the resource unit is now capable of being assigned to two or more threads and argues that Bleloch does not disclose the limitation that the thread requests the use of the resource unit, it is noted that the router RT 1, which performs routing function for the processing elements, is now interpreted as the resource unit. As shown in the drawing of Fig. 2, RT 1 is assigned to two or more processing elements, which reads on the limitations that the resource unit (RT 1) is now capable of being assigned to two or more threads (two or more processing elements) and the threads request the use of the resource unit (the processing elements request the use of RT 1, see col. 4, lines 60-67).

Therefore, in light of the reasonings mentioned above, claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bleloch et al.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Mew whose telephone number is 571-272-3141. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2664

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 571-272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KDM
Art Unit 2664



WELLINGTON CHIN
PERVISOY PATENT EXAMINEE